

Springfield, ILL. More than the frontier hamlet of New Salem, ILL. More than the White House itself.

Here he was not only commander in chief, but also husband, father and human being. No wonder he would take risks to ride out here every chance he got.

The house is structurally sound—always has been and always will be, Ms. Childress said: "We will always take care of it." It's not restored, so it's not pretty, but it could be.

Unfortunately, the Soldiers' Home doesn't have the money to do it. The home has been funded from its beginning by small deductions from enlisted men's pay—now 50 cents a month, plus any fines and forfeitures from disciplinary actions. It has never been supported by taxpayer dollars.

But with the downsizing of the military, less money is coming in because there are fewer soldiers to fund the deductions. The effect has been "devastating," Ms. Childress said, "just devastating."

A rescuer may be coming, however. The United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home is negotiating with the National Trust for Historic Preservation to have the trust take care of the cottage.

Rather than having it become just another Victorian house with antique furniture. Ms. Childress said she hopes it can be used as a learning center for an array of related topics: the Civil War, the effects of the Emancipation Proclamation, Lincoln himself. But all that, she said, is still a long way off.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. ANTHONY D. WEINER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1999

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 219, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

#### CONSEQUENCES FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

**HON. RICK HILL**

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1501) to provide grants to ensure increased accountability for juvenile offenders:

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, people own guns for many reasons. They use them for hunting. They use them for recreational shooting. And they use them for self defense.

About 2 million times a year, people use guns to defend themselves, their families and businesses.

So what does this have to do with trigger locks?

It requires that guns be sold with trigger locks. That doesn't seem unreasonable. In fact about 80% of guns sold today are sold with trigger locks. That seems pretty reasonable.

What's wrong with the amendment is that it requires gun owners to keep a trigger lock on their guns.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

It accomplishes this by saying that gun owners are liable for the criminal use of a stolen gun that was stored without a trigger lock.

Someone breaks into your home, steals your gun, robs or kills with it, and you are held responsible.

Mr. Chairman, I hold here a trigger lock. In the small print it says "don't use on a loaded gun."

So what the practical implications of this amendment are:

You can no longer keep a loaded gun in your night stand to defend your family.

When the armed intruder enters your home, here is what you will have to do

Find the key. Unlock the trigger. Remove the trigger lock. Load the gun.

If that crook is armed, you have no chance of defending yourself.

Mr. Chairman, there are two groups who really support this amendment:

Crooks who would invade our homes and harm our families and trial lawyers who would be enriched.

The losers are honest, law abiding citizens who want to defend themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

#### COMMEMORATING THE SERVICE OF SANDRA K. HOGAN

**HON. RICHARD W. POMBO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1999

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and pay tribute to Ms. Sandra K. Hogan, Director of the Legislative and Regulatory Review Office of USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS). Ms. Hogan will retire, July 3rd after 37 years of service to AMS. For 33 of those years, she has not only served 13 AMS Administrators, but has also been a valuable asset to Congress in her role as the Congressional Liaison for AMS.

Ms. Hogan's breadth of knowledge about the extensive programs which AMS administers and her professionalism have always been greatly appreciated by all who have worked with her. You always knew that when you needed to get a clear explanation about a complicated AMS issue or quick assistance in drafting legislation, Ms. Hogan would be able to handle the job. AMS issues certainly do not make that job easy. Ms. Hogan has had to be proficient in issues from Federal Milk Marketing Orders, commodity grading, plant patents, agricultural transportation concerns, commodity purchases for the federal feeding programs, the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act (PACA), Organic Certification, and the ever increasing number of commodity checkoff programs, to name a few. To illustrate the breadth of her career, about the same time Ms. Hogan started in the job of Congressional Liaison, Congress passed the first industry funded commodity checkoff legislation for the cotton industry, the Cotton Research and Promotion Act. Ms. Hogan has since supervised the enactment of 19 individual checkoff statutes and the most recently enacted "generic statute."

Ms. Hogan is an exceptional breed of public servant who has always put customer service first and luckily for us, she considered Congress to be one of her most important customers. Ms. Hogan's graciousness, professionalism and extensive knowledge of the multitude of AMS programs and history will be sorely missed. I commend her on her distinctive career and wish her well as she returns to her native West Virginia.

#### MANDATORY GUN SHOW BACKGROUND CHECK ACT

SPEECH OF

**HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2122) to require background checks at gun shows, and for other purposes:

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, guns are out of control.

Tonight, this House should not turn a deaf ear to the families and victims of Littleton, Colorado.

This Congress should strengthen the bipartisan Brady Bill by passing the McCarthy amendment to expand background checks to gun shows.

Five and a half years ago, this body debated the Brady Bill.

The gun lobby and its supporters in this body said it wouldn't work. It wouldn't work, they said, because criminals didn't buy their guns in stores.

Well, they were wrong.

Since that time, over 400,000 illegal gun sales were prevented.

Thanks to the Brady Bill, 400,000 fewer guns are on our streets and in the hands of criminals.

Thankfully, we will never know how many lives would have been lost if those guns had been sold. We will never know how many children would have died if this Congress have failed to take action and pass the Brady Bill.

Mr. Chairman, some have suggested that the waiting period should be changed from three business days to only 24 or 72 hours. But the vast majority of gun buyers complete their checks in a few hours. It is only those who are convicted of felony charges, or have a record of domestic violence or drug abuse who are denied their guns, and we need those extra days to conduct a thorough check.

So now, when the NRA comes back to Congress to argue that we shouldn't close the gun-show loophole, that we shouldn't subject gun buyers at gun shows to the same background check as gun buyers in stores, I urge my colleagues not to be swayed by their deception.

If we accomplish nothing else in the name of gun safety, we must close the gun-show loophole.

I applaud my colleague from New York for her courage and her determination, and I urge my colleagues to support the McCarthy amendment, and Mr. CONYERS' substitute.